



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,811	01/31/2001	David Aro Bruton III	5577-223	2267
20792	7590	12/08/2005	EXAMINER	
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC PO BOX 37428 RALEIGH, NC 27627			ZHONG, CHAD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/773,811	BRUTON ET AL.
	Examiner Chad Zhong	Art Unit 2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.
2. It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in specification and claims, the line numbers in the claims do not correspond to the preferred format. The preferred format is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both the Examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.

Claim Analysis

3. Claim 1 will be interpreted as follows. Receiving user requests to transmit packets over a network to a second node over the network, a determination is made to see if the user has access rights to access said second node within a security zone. If the user is authorized for access, the packets are forwarded towards the second node in said security zone. The term “security zone” is loosely used in the claim, specification failed to particularly point out or define the phrase “security zone”. The Examiner interpret “*security zone*” in light of the specification, as a group resources, i.e. network nodes, in a particular network, for example, a domain, a zone/area on a network comprising multiple network nodes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cacace-Bailey et al.

(hereinafter Cacace-Bailey), US 6,611,916.

6. As per claim 1, Cacace-Bailey teaches a method for selectively allowing a user of a multi-user system access a plurality of resources in a network, the method comprising:

receiving a request originated from the user to transmit a message over network to one of plurality of resources (Col. 5, lines 55-56, first user's browser summit access request to another node on the second domain);

identifying, from a plurality of security zones, a security zone associated with the one of the plurality of resources (Col. 5, lines 50-53, user select the domain he/she wishes to access, identifying is done by directing a browser to a secure domain via an URL, where secure domain is interpreted as secure zone);

determining if the user is authorized access to the identified security zone (Col. 6, lines 13-18, second domain system authenticate the user to see if the network node has access rights to the second secure domain); and

forwarding the message over the network to the one of the plurality resources only if it determined that the user is authorized access to the identified security zone (Col. 6, lines 16-24, authentication information authenticated, access is granted to the authenticated node).

7. As per claim 2, Cacace-Bailey teaches

associating a security zone with each of the plurality resources (Col. 3, lines 1-5, where each of the plurality of network nodes are associated with at least one secure environment / secure domain).

8. As per claim 3, Cacace-Bailey teaches:

specifying the security zones to which users of the multi-user system are authorized users (Col. 6, lines 13-23, each secure domain has authentication list to authenticate the requesting users).

9. As per claim 4, Cacace-Bailey teaches:

accessing a data structure that specifies the security zone associated with each resource in the plurality of resources (Col. 6, lines 13-25, data structure implicitly exist within the second secure domain server. Note, the users from the first secure domain are accessing other nodes within the second secure domain, however an authentication with the second secure domain server is a pre-requisite prior to such access. Users of the first secure domain must inherently specify their own identification along with the information (i.e. second domain name and the access location) they wish to access within the second secure domain because such information are user specific, and must be identified for authorized access. Therefore, a table/database/data structure comprising the domain as well as node identifier are inherently taught in Cacace-Bailey).

10. As per claim 5, Cacace-Bailey teaches:

wherein at least one entry in the data structure specifies the security zone associated with a group of the resources in the plurality of resources (Col. 6, lines 13-25, data structure implicitly exist within the second secure domain server. Note, the users from the first secure domain are accessing other nodes within the second secure domain, however an authentication with the second secure domain server is a pre-requisite prior to such access. Users of the first secure domain must inherently specify their own identification along with the information (i.e. second domain name and the access location) they wish to access within the second secure domain because such information are user specific, and must be identified for authorized access. Therefore, a table/database/data structure comprising the domain as well as node identifier are inherently taught in Cacace-Bailey), and wherein identifying the security zone associated with the one of plurality of resources comprises identifying the security zone associated with the most specific entry in the data structure that includes the resource (Fig 1b, 2, Col. 6, lines 13-25, further justify the identification of resources/nodes within the table/database/data structure. When attempting to access the second secure domain, the first secure domain does its own authentication. Without specifying the user nodes as well as the domain which the nodes are associated with, first secure domain would not

allow proper authentication. Upon authenticating with the second secure domain server, the users are accessing remote nodes located within second secure domain, therefore, the remote nodes are inherently identified within their access request in order for the second secure domain to forward packets upon proper authentication which are user request specific).

11. As per claim 6, Cacace-Bailey teaches:

the identifying and determining steps are performed within the multi-user system (Fig 2, item 20 and 30).

12. As per claim 7, Cacace-Bailey teaches:

querying a security manager of the multi-user system to determine if the user is authorized access to the security zone associated with the one of the plurality of resources (Col. 6, lines 13-23, security manager is the secure domain servers, the secure domain servers check to see if the node has access to a particular domain, note, that each node is associated with at least one domain).

13. As per claim 8, Cacace-Bailey teaches:

the request to transmit a message is denied if it is determined that the user is not authorized access to the security zone associated with the one of plurality of resources before any data packets associated with the message are forwarded over the network (Col. 6, lines 13-23, secure domain server denies the request to access information on the second domain no information packets are exchanged after the deny of access).

14. As per claim 9, Cacace-Bailey teaches:

the network is an internet protocol network (Col. 2, line 65 – Col. 3, line 1).

15. As per claim 10, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 1 above, in addition, Cacace-Bailey teaches:

classifying the resource as being associated with a security zone from a plurality of security zones (Col. 6, lines 1-10, wherein a node on the network is classified as belonging to a first secure domain and has authentication rights associated with the first domain).

16. As per claim 11, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 1 above.

17. As per claim 12, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to combination of claims 1 and 4 above respectively.

18. As per claim 13, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 5 above.

19. As per claims 14-18, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 1-5 above respectively.

20. As per claims 19-23, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 1-5 above respectively.

21. As per claim 24, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 1 above.

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to

“Methods, Systems And Computer Program Products For Selectively Allowing Users Of A Multi-User System Access To Network Resources”

- i. US 2003-0041267 Fee et al.
- ii. US 5548649 Jacobson
- iii. US 6473800 Jerger et al.
- iv. US 2002-0099944 Bowlin
- v. US 2001-0052073 Kern et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (571)272-3946. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAROENCHONWANIT, BUNJOB can be reached on (571)272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CZ
November 30, 2005



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER